



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

SD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,981	01/18/2002	Robert J. Robinson	02-097-US	8791
26587	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
MCNEES, WALLACE & NURICK LLC 100 PINE STREET P.O. BOX 1166 HARRISBURG, PA 17108-1166				HOLLAR, ANDREA B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2142				

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/050,981	ROBINSON, ROBERT J.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Andrea Hollar	2142		.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2002.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 1, 7, 11 and 12 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2002 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 12, 110, 200, and 420. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the reference number 314 on page 26, line 16 is not found in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the reference number 312 on page 26, line 16 is not found in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 12 contains the phrase "server an end user". It is assumed that "server to an end user" was intended. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 13 contains the phrase "data entry said end user". It is assumed that "data entry by said end user" was intended. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 5, "verify" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 19, "verify" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim reads "wherein said global network is wherein the global network is the Internet..." It is assumed that "wherein said global network is the Internet" was intended. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevion (5,455,875) in view of Zlotnick (6,760,490).

With respect to claim 1, Chevion discloses a system for entering and verifying the accuracy of data from a document comprising:

a control unit for inputting a document (fig. 1, item 20);

a computer system connected to said control unit (fig. 1, item 10), said computer system comprising an application server (fig. 3, item 90) and a database server (fig. 3, item 100), and having software means for defining a plurality of data fields from the document such that each data field defines

and corresponds to at least one unique data entry (col. 4, lines 42-43) and for reversibly scrambling said unique data entry (col. 6, lines 25-27);

means for entering (col. 5, line 30) and verifying (col. 5, line 16) each unique data entry by said end user;

means for securely receiving back each entered and verified unique data entry from said end user (col. 7, lines 1-2); and

means for ensuring the accuracy of each unique data entry entered and verified by said end user, and for accepting said data entry as valid if accurate (col. 8, lines 8-13).

Chevion does not expressly disclose a network server linked to the computer system by a first communication link and means for securely transmitting said unique data entry from the network server to an end user.

Zlotnick teaches that a data entry and verification system can be implemented over a network with the verification operator workstation being located remotely from the server (fig. 1) and that the data entry and verification information can be sent over a network link (col. 6, line 27) from the server to the remote terminal (col. 5, lines 53-54).

Chevion and Zlotnick are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of data entry systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Chevion's system in a network environment with the verification terminal being located remotely from the server and input device, as taught by Zlotnick.

The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the connection of multiple verification terminals to one server (col. 5, lines 55-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Zlotnick with Chevion for the benefit of connecting multiple verification terminals to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With respect to claim 3, Chevion further discloses that said software means for reversibly scrambling the unique data entry comprises software which scrambles the unique data entry from several

documents (col. 4, lines 55-57; col. 6, lines 25-27), and assigns and attaches one or more unique identifiers to each unique data entry (col. 6, lines 51-59).

With respect to claim 4, Zlotnick discloses that said means for securely transmitting scrambled unique data entry from said network server to said end user comprises a second communication link to a global network (col. 6, lines 25-27).

With respect to claim 5, Zlotnick further discloses that said global network is the Internet, a local area network, or a wide area network (col. 6, lines 25-27).

With respect to claim 6, Zlotnick discloses that said means for entering and verifying each unique data entry comprises one or more remote keying stations linked to a global network by one or more communication links (fig. 1, item 36).

With respect to claim 7, Chevion further discloses that said means for ensuring the accuracy of data entered and verified by said end user comprises software which transmits said unique data entry to at least one different end user for entry and verification and accepts said data entry as accurate if at least two end users enter and verify the data entry identically (col. 8, lines 8-13).

With respect to claim 11, Chevion discloses a system for entering and verifying the accuracy of data from a form comprising:

a control unit for inputting information from a document to be verified (fig. 1, item 20) and defining a plurality of data fields from the document such that each data field defines and corresponds to at least one unique data entry (col. 4, lines 42-43);

a computer system (fig. 1, item 10) comprising an application server (fig. 3, item 90) and a database server (fig. 3, item 100), said computer system connected to said control unit (fig. 1, items 10 and 20), said computer system having software which reversibly scrambles the unique data entry from the form (col. 6, lines 25-27) and assigns and attaches one or more unique identifiers to each unique data entry (col. 6, lines 51-59); and

network server and computer system software which receives data entered by said end user, compares the data entry to data entry from at least one different data entry source, and accepts the data

entry as accurate if at least two data entry sources enter and verify the data entry identically (col. 8, lines 8-13).

Chevion does not expressly disclose:

a network server linked to said computer system by a secure communication link;

a global network linked to said network server for securely transmitting scrambled unique data entry to an end user; and

at least one remote keying station linked to said global network by one or more communication links.

Zlotnick teaches that a data entry and verification system can be implemented over a network with the verification operator workstation being located remotely from the server (fig. 1) and that the data entry and verification information can be sent over a network link (col. 6, line 27) from the server to the remote terminal (col. 5, lines 53-54).

Chevion and Zlotnick are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of data entry systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Chevion's system in a network environment with the verification terminal being located remotely from the server and input device, as taught by Zlotnick.

The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the connection of multiple verification terminals to one server (col. 5, lines 55-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Zlotnick with Chevion for the benefit of connecting multiple verification terminals to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

With respect to claim 12, Zlotnick discloses that the global network is the Internet, a Local Area Network, or a Wide Area Network (col. 6, lines 25-27).

With respect to claim 14, Chevion discloses a method for entering data and verifying the accuracy of data from a form comprising:

inputting a form using a control unit (col. 4, lines 1-2);

defining a plurality of data fields on the form to be entered and verified (col. 4, lines 40-42);

defining one or more unique data entries from each data field to be entered and verified (col. 4, lines 42-43);

extracting each unique data entry to create a snippet (col. 4, lines 42-43);

reversibly scrambling said snippet to ensure confidentiality of the form (col. 6, lines 25-27);

using a graphic user interface to present said snippet to said end user to allow said end user to correctly enter and verify data entry corresponding to said snippet (col. 6, lines 63-66);

receiving said entered and verified data entry from said end user (col. 7, lines 1-2); and

accepting as valid said entered and verified data entry if confirmed as accurate against data entry from at least one other source (col. 8, lines 8-13).

Chevion does not expressly disclose transmitting said snippet to an end user via a communication link to a global computer network.

Zlotnick teaches that a data entry and verification system can be implemented over a network with the verification operator workstation being located remotely from the server (fig. 1) and that the data entry and verification information can be sent over a network link (col. 6, line 27) from the server to the remote terminal (col. 5, lines 53-54).

Chevion and Zlotnick are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of data entry systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Chevion's system in a network environment with the verification terminal being located remotely from the server and input device, as taught by Zlotnick.

The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the connection of multiple verification terminals to one server (col. 5, lines 55-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Zlotnick with Chevion for the benefit of connecting multiple verification terminals to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

With respect to claim 16, Chevion further discloses that the step of defining one or more unique data entries from each data field further comprises dividing data fields into sub-fields so that no single unique data entry or snippet represents the entire data field (col. 4, lines 42-43).

With respect to claim 17, Chevion further discloses the step of randomly ordering said data fields so that no two snippets corresponding to said data fields from the same form are ever dispatched to the same end user (col. 4, lines 55-57).

With respect to claim 20, Chevion further discloses the step of ensuring that end users are aware of the type of data which is expected to be entered for a given field (col. 6, lines 65).

With respect to claim 21, Zlotnick discloses that the global computer network is the Internet, a local area network, or a wide area network (col. 6, lines 25-27).

With respect to claim 22, Zlotnick discloses that said end user is a remote end user (fig. 1, item 36).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevion in view of Zlotnick as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Chevion and Zlotnick do not expressly disclose that said first communication link comprises a firewall.

Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary teaches that it is known to use a firewall between a local unit and an external network (p. 197, lines 26-37).

Chevion, Zlotnick, and Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of computing systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to put a firewall between the scanning terminal and the server disclosed by Zlotnick to increase security because firewalls protect networks against hacking threats, as taught by Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (p. 197, lines 26-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Chevion, Zlotnick, and Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary for the benefit of added network security to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Claims 8-9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevion in view of Zlotnick as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Burch (6,295,387).

With respect to claims 8 and 9, Chevion and Zlotnick do not expressly disclose that said means for ensuring the accuracy of data entered and verified by said end user comprises software which compares data entry entered by said end user to data captured by recognition technologies and that said means for ensuring the accuracy of data keyed and verified by said end user comprises software which compares data entry entered by said end user to data from a cross reference table.

Burch teaches comparing data entered by an operator with data acquired and stored by an automated recognition method in order to verify the entered data's accuracy (col. 2, lines 39-42; lines 57-58).

Chevion, Zlotnick, and Burch are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of data entry systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace Chevion's method of double-checking the entered data manually with Burch's method of comparing the entered data to data obtained by an automated recognition method.

The motivation for doing so would have been to omit the need for another operator to manually enter the data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chevion and Zlotnick with Burch for the benefit of reduced manpower to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 9.

With respect to claim 18, Chevion and Zlotnick do not expressly disclose the step of administering access by individual remote end users based upon the individual end user's performance.

Burch teaches that it is known to use high-performing operators to verify particular types of data (col. 1, lines 33-41).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize high-performing operators with Chevion's system because they are proven to be reliable and accurate (col. 1, line 36).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Chevion and Zlotnick with Burch for the benefit of reliable and accurate operators to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Claims 10, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevion in view of Zlotnick as applied to claims 1, 11, and 14 above, and further in view of Kelly (2003/0046196).

Chevion and Zlotnick do not expressly disclose means for compensating said end user for the correct entry and verification of said data entry.

Kelly teaches that it is known that employees must be compensated for their work (par. 10, lines 2-3).

Chevion, Zlotnick, and Kelly are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of software systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that an operator of Chevion's system would have to be paid for the work. The motivation for doing so would have been to retain the operator and encourage future work.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Chevion and Zlotnick with Kelly for the benefit of operator retention to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 13, and 15.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevion in view of Zlotnick as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Motoiwa (6,343,149).

Chevion and Zlotnick do not expressly disclose the step of improving data entry efficiency and accuracy by end users by ensuring that indecipherable fields are never presented to remote users.

Motoiwa teaches that operators should not operate on data that is impossible to read (col. 9, lines 10-14).

Chevion, Zlotnick, and Motoiwa are all analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor of data entry systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to not present Chevion's operators with data that is indecipherable, as taught by Motoiwa. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the speed at which the operators can work.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Chevion and Zlotnick with Motoiwa for the benefit of increased operator speed to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea Hollar whose telephone number is 571-272-5862. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on 571-272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ABH

  
JACK HARVEY  
USPTO - PATENT EXAMINER